

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,592	01/22/2002	Guanggu Sun	0111.1L1	1218
7590 01/02/2004			EXAM	INER
David T. Brad		PRATT, HELEN F		
4839 Bond Av	e of David T. Bracken enue	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Orange, CA	92869	1761		
			DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, *	Applica	ition No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		,592	SUN, GUANGGU				
		er	Art Unit				
	Helen F	<u> </u>	1761				
The MAILING DATE of this comme Period for Reply	unication appears on t	he cover sheet with t	he correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU - Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for re - Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	NICATION. ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no mmunication. or (30) days, a reply within the s statutory period will apply and ply will, by statute, cause the a s after the mailing date of this	event, however, may a reply tatutory minimum of thirty (30 I will expire SIX (6) MONTHS pplication to become ABANI	be timely filed) days will be considered timely, from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) t	iled on						
2a) This action is FINAL .	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the	P)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12,15 and 19</u> is/are rej	Claim(s) <u>1-12,15 and 19</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13,14 and 16-18</u> is/are ol	Claim(s) <u>13,14 and 16-18</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to rest	riction and/or election	requirement.					
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/a	re: a)□ accepted or	b) objected to by	the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any ob-	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner.	Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a cla a) All b) Some * c) None of 1. Certified copies of the priori 2. Certified copies of the priori 3. Copies of the certified copie application from the Interna * See the attached detailed Office ac 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim since a specific reference was include 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign I 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim reference was included in the first see	ty documents have be ty documents have be es of the priority docur tional Bureau (PCT R tion for a list of the ce of for domestic priority ded in the first senten anguage provisional	een received. een received in Appl ments have been rec cule 17.2(a)). rtified copies not rec under 35 U.S.C. § 1 ce of the specificatio application has beer under 35 U.S.C. §§	ication No seived in this National Stage eived. 19(e) (to a provisional application) in or in an Application Data Sheet. received. 120 and/or 121 since a specific				
Attachment(s)		A) [] Inter-2-1-1-0	(DTO 440) December (2)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)			mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 11-18 are indefinite in the use of the phrase "liquid water". Water is a liquid, therefore the use of the word "liquid" is redundant.

Claim 16 is indefinite in the use of the phrase "is ingested by a human user with the gel coat powder before substantial swelling of the glucomannan occurs". It is not known what is intended by this phrase. Perhaps the phrase could read "and is ingested by a human user before substantial swelling of the glucomannan occurs".

Claim 19 is indefinite in the use of the phrase "such as". The phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claims 13-14, 16-18 are indefinite in the use of the phrase "substantial swelling of the glucomannan". The specification does not give a definition for this phrase and it is not known what amount of swelling can be allowed. However, the specification does give a time limit for the delay of viscosity of 5-10 minutes which could be added to the claims and would be more definite (page 4, lines 23-30).

Art Unit: 1761

Miscellaneous

It is noted in claim 1, "glucommannan" should be "glucomannan".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Takata (6,558,652).

Takata '652 discloses a process of making a particulate glucomannan gel as in claims 1 and 6, by swelling the glucomannan flour with water in the presence of water/ethanol (40-50% ethanol) and treating the swollen particles with an alkali (sodium hydroxide or sodium carbonate) to form gelled particles followed by drying (abstract). The flour is a commercially available glucomannan powder with a particle size of 100-200 mesh which is less than the claimed size of 160 microns (100 mesh equals 149 microns). A gel membrane is seen to have formed because the process is the same and the reference discloses that a hydrogel is formed and that "gelled flour particles are formed" (col. 1, lines 30-40, col. 2, lines 19-49).

The mixture is filtered as in claim 2 to remove liquid (col. 3, lines 40-49).

The mixture as in step (a) is allowed to stand for 2 hours as in claim 7.

The gel-coated powder is contacted with substantial amounts of water as in claim 11 (col. 3, lines 50-70, and col. 4, lines 1-31).

The water is prevented as in claim 12 from being absorbed by the glucomannan by the gel coat for more than 2 minutes, since, the above process has been shown, and therefore, the preventative gel coat is the same.

Claim 15 further requires that the gel-coated powder be contacted with small amounts of a liquid. Takata discloses adding the gel-coated powder to water to make a cleaning foam, toothpaste or cleaning powder (col. 3, lines 25-54). The particular amount of water is not disclosed. These items inherently contain small amounts of water or they wouldn't be able to function as foams, toothpastes or cleaning powders.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takata.

Art Unit: 1761

Claim 8 further requires that the mixture of step a is allowed to remain in an undisturbed state for less than ten minutes and claim 9, that the mixture of step b is left for 10 minutes and step 10 for 30 minutes. However, it is seen that as the function of each alcohol in step a of precipitating konjac is known (col. 2, lines 15-19) and the function of the sodium or calcium salt solution is known which is to give discrete hydrogels (col. 2, lines 32-40), then it would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker to maintain the konjac flour in undisturbed states as in steps a and b in order for the reactants to perform there known functions to a particular degree of precipitation and gel strength. Therefore, it would have been obvious to allow the konjac (glucomannan) to remain in an undisturbed state in the various steps for particular lengths of time.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takata as applied to the above claims, and further in view of Kubodera (4,851,394).

Claim 19 further requires that the gel-coated powder can be other fibers such as guar or alginic gum. Kubodera discloses a process of making a glucomannan gel by mixing the glucomannan with a polyhydric alcohol in the presence of an alkali which can be sodium carbonate (abstract and col. 4, lines 29-40 and col. 3, lines 59-64, col. 4, lines 1-25). Even though Kubodera does not use the claimed particle size of konjac (glucomannan), he does disclose that gelled konjac can be produced by the claimed method (col. 3, lines 25-35 and col. 5, lines 5-10) and he does use small particle sizes of konjac. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use other soluble fibers to make a gel coated powder.

Art Unit: 1761

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13, 14, 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen F. Pratt whose telephone number is 703-308-1978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Milton Cano, can be reached on (703) 308-3959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Hp 12-16-03

HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6